



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/867,684	05/31/2001	Yoshiharu Gotanda	0879-0316P	7218

2292 7590 12/11/2006

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

YE, LIN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2622

DATE MAILED: 12/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/867,684

Applicant(s)

GOTANDA, YOSHIHARU

Examiner

Lin Ye

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims 8-23 have been considered and are persuasive, because the applicant's representative, Catherine M. Voisinet has pointed out the secondary reference (Fumio et al. U.S. Patent 6,515,705) does not teaches the controlling device which controls lens cover driving device to close the lens cover instead of the mechanical device during the telephone interview with the examiner on 11/28/2006. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made. This action is not made final.

Although a new ground of rejection has been used to address the limitations "the controlling device controls said lens cover driving device to close said lens cover when said first mode is set by said mode setting device" as recited in the claim 1, a response is considered necessary for several of the applicant's arguments filed on 11/16/2006, since the primary reference (Umezawa et al. U.S. Patent 5,491,507) will continue to be used to meet several of the claimed limitations.

For claim 8, the applicant argues that Umezawa (U.S. Patent 5,491,507) already provides for protecting the lens of the camera when the camera is not in use in order to avoid scratches on the surface of the camera. Therefore, the examiner fails to provide any motivation as to why one skilled in the art would modify Umezawa et al. as suggested when the resultant functionality is already achieved by the disclosure of Umezawa (See Applicant's REMARKS, page 3, lines 1-7).

The examiner disagrees. The system of Umezawa is not just simple telephone equipment. The system of Umezawa is an electronic device comprising a telephone device and a camera device. The Umezawa reference uses the indent 25 for protecting the lens of the camera when the camera is not in use in order to avoid scratches on the surface of the camera lens. However, as shown in Figure 6, the lens 24 is manually pulled up to engage with the indent 25 (see Col. 7, lines 65-67). The inconvenience of manually pulling a lens often causes a damage of lens accidentally. It is well known in the camera art that using a controlling device controls a lens cover driving unit to drive a lens cover for **completely and safely** covering a surface of the camera lens when the camera is not in use. In an additional benefit, when the camera 3 is equipped the automatic lens cover, the indent 25 can be taken out from the antenna 21 so that the telephone device structure can be designed more compact and simple. The new reference (Watanabe et al. U.S. 6,545,775) is cited for supporting the above examiner's statement. Please see the detail on the following art rejection sections.

For claim 8, the applicant argues that the Umezawa reference discloses that the user can use the equipment as a normal telephone even though the equipment is being operated in the video telephone mode. Applicant maintains that these teachings are insufficient to teach or suggest prohibiting the electronic device from performing functions related to the camera whenever the first mode is set by the mode setting device (See Applicant's REMARKS, page 3, lines 8-17).

The examiner disagrees. The examiner clearly states the Umezawa's **ordinary telephone mode** is considered as the "**first mode**" for a function which is unrelated to camera functions as recited in claim 8 in last office action, page 4, lines 20-23 mailed on

8/16/2006. The Umezawa reference discloses the ordinary telephone conversation corresponding to speech only (See Col. 10, lines 55-67), the case of the telephone conversation corresponding neither the display panel 11 nor the camera 3 can be used. (See Col. 11, lines 17-20). Therefore, the Umezawa reference teaches prohibiting the electronic device from performing functions related to the camera whenever the first mode (ordinary telephone conversation) is set by the mode setting device. It should be noted that the another mode, such as video telephone mode can have options to same attitude as ordinary telephone mode, but does not means the ordinary telephone mode has the attitude of video telephone which can operate the camera.

For claim 20, the language in claim 20 is written broadly and does not require “the controlling device controls said lens cover driving device to close said lens cover when said first mode is set by said mode setting device” as recited in claim 8. Therefore, Claims 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Umezawa et al. U.S. Patent 5,491,507. Please see the detail on the following art rejection sections

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Umezawa et al. U.S. Patent 5,491,507.

Referring to claim 20, the Umezawa reference discloses in Figure 1, a method for controlling a digital media device comprising: determining the state of a mode selection device (by mode setting button 15a, see Col. 8, lines 31-33); establishing one of a first mode of operation (ordinary vocal telephone mode) and a second mode of operation (visual telephone mode) based upon the determining, wherein the first mode of operation provides a function unrelated to functions of a digital camera (e.g., the ordinary telephone conversation corresponding to speech only, see Col. 10, lines 55-67; the case of the telephone conversation corresponding neither the display panel 11 nor the camera 3 can be used, see Col. 11, lines 17-20); and protecting a taking lens of the digital media device during the first mode of operation as shown in Figure 6 (the indent 25 for protecting the lens of the camera when the camera is not in use during the ordinary telephone conversation in order to avoid scratches on the surface of the camera lens, see Col. 7, lines 60-67 and Col. 8, lines 1-5).

Referring to claim 21, the Umezawa reference discloses wherein the first mode of operation (the ordinary telephone mode) provides functionality associated with non-image data (e.g., voice data only).

Referring to claim 22, the Umezawa reference discloses wherein the first mode (ordinary vocal telephone mode) permits portable operation (voice communication operation).

Referring to claim 23, the Umezawa reference discloses wherein the first mode of operation (the ordinary telephone mode) functions without being operable coupled to a personal computer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 8-10, 12 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Umezawa et al. U.S. Patent 5,491,507 in view of Watanabe et al. U.S. Patent 6,545,775.

Referring to claim 8, the Umezawa reference discloses in Figure 1, an electronic device comprising: a mode setting device (button 15a, see Col. 8, lines 31-33) that sets a first mode (ordinary vocal telephone mode) for a function which is unrelated to camera functions (e.g., the ordinary telephone mode is consider as the first mode corresponding to speech only, see Col. 10, lines 57-68); and a controlling device of equipment (1) that prohibits the electronic device from performing functions related to the camera whenever said first mode is set by said mode setting device (e.g., the case of the telephone conversation corresponding neither the display panel 11 nor the camera 3 can be used, see Col. 11, lines 17-20); and a taking lens (24) and image sensing element (3) as shown in Figure 1. However, the Umezawa reference does not explicitly show a lens cover for the taking lens, and the controlling device controls the lens cover driving device to close the lens cover when camera is not using for perform the camera functions (in the ordinary vocal telephone mode).

The Watanabe reference teaches in Figures 2, 8 and 9, the camera including an automatic lens cover (18 as shown in Figure 2); and the controlling device (control unit 16) controls the

Art Unit: 2622

lens cover driving device (lens cover driving unit 14) to close the lens cover when camera is not using for perform the camera functions (e.g., in Figures 8-9, when the angle ΦC is zero as camera is not using for perform the camera function or image pickup action is terminated, the control unit 16 sends a control signal to the lens covert driving unit 14 to cause the lens cover 18 to be closed, see Col. 10, line s62-67, Col 11, lines 1-9 and Col. 9, lines 49-52).

The Watanabe reference is evidence the one of ordinary skill in the art at the time to see more advantage for the electronic camera system having an automatic lens cover for **automatically, completely and securely** covering the surface of the camera lens when the camera is not in use so that avoiding **any** scratches, waterdrops or dust on the surface of the camera lens. For that reason, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time to modify the electronic device of Umezawa ('507) for providing a lens cover for the taking lens, and the controlling device controls the lens cover driving device to close lens cover when first mode is set (camera is not using for perform the camera functions) as taught by Watanabe ('775). In an additional benefit, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time to see when the camera 3 is equipped the automatic lens cover, the indent 25 can be taken out from the antenna 21 so that the telephone device structure can be designed more compactly and simply.

Referring to claim 9, the Umezawa and Watanabe references disclose all subject matter as discussed with respected to claim 8, and the Umezawa reference discloses wherein said first mode (ordinary vocal telephone mode) is for a portable phone function.

Referring to claim 10, the Umezawa and Watanabe references disclose all subject matter as discussed with respected to claim 8, and the Umezawa reference discloses wherein said

controlling device does not accept an input from a switch of the camera (e.g., the ordinary telephone conversation corresponding to only the voices, neither the display panel 11 nor the camera 3 can be used, see Col. 11, lines 17-20) when said first mode (ordinary vocal telephone mode) is set by said mode setting device (15a), said switch being provided to a body of the camera for the functions of the camera (e.g., visual telephone mode, see Col. 10, lines 15-16).

Referring to claim 12, the Umezawa and Watanabe references disclose all subject matter as discussed with respect to claim 8, and the Umezawa reference discloses wherein said mode setting device (button 15a) chooses between said first mode (ordinary vocal telephone mode) and a second mode (visual telephone mode) for the functions of the camera.

Referring to claim 16, the Umezawa and Watanabe references disclose all subject matter as discussed with respect to claim 8, and the Fumio reference discloses wherein said taking lens is collapsed (until it is in the unused position) before said lens cover is closed (See Col. 5, lines 62-67).

Referring to claim 17, the Umezawa and Watanabe references disclose all subject matter as discussed with respect to claim 8, and the Umezawa reference discloses wherein the mode setting device (button 15a) is physically actuated directly by a user (See Col. 8, lines 31-32).

Referring to claim 18, the Umezawa and Watanabe references disclose all subject matter as discussed with respect to claim 8, and the Umezawa reference discloses wherein the mode setting device does not set the first mode based upon a detection of a personal computer cable (e.g., the first mode is ordinary vocal telephone mode).

Referring to claim 19, the Umezawa and Watanabe references disclose all subject matter as discussed with respect to claim 8, and the Umezawa reference discloses wherein the first mode (ordinary vocal telephone mode) permits portable operation (voice communication operation).

6. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Umezawa et al. U.S. Patent 5,491,507 in view of Watanabe et al. U.S. Patent 6,545,775 and Oeda et al. U.S. Publication 2001/0012071.

Referring to claim 11, the Umezawa and Watanabe references disclose all subject matter as discussed with respect to claim 8, except the references do not explicitly show the lens cover is opened when the recording mode (image pick up mode) is set, and does not move the lens cover when the play mode (reproduction mode) is set.

The Oeda reference discloses in Figure 3, the electronic camera has a recording mode (image pick up mode) for recording image data in a storage medium (flash memory 26 in Figure 4) in the camera, and a play mode for playing an image on a monitor (LCD 29) according to the image data stored in the storage medium in the camera; and controlling device (system controller 15) controls the lens cover switch to open only in recording mode, and does not open the lens cover in the play mode. The Oeda reference is evidence the one of ordinary skill in the art at the time to see more advantage for the electronic camera system open the lens cover when camera using image pick up unit for photographing and does not move the lens cover when camera only using for reproduction to display image data stored in memory, so that lens cover can protect the taking lens effectively. For that reason, it would

have been obvious to the one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the electronic device of Umezawa ('507) for providing the lens cover is opened when the recording mode (image pick up mode) is set, and does not move the lens cover when the play mode (reproduction mode) is set as taught by Oeda ('071).

7. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Umezawa et al. U.S. Patent 5,491,507 in view of Watanabe et al. U.S. Patent 6,545,775 and Tanaka et al. U.S. Publication 2002/0191096.

Referring to claim 5, the Umezawa and Watanabe references disclose all subject matter as discussed in respected claim 12, except that the Umezawa reference does not explicitly states the camera mode which includes said recording mode and the play mode; and the electronic camera further comprises another mode setting device that chooses between said recording mode and the play mode when the camera mode is set.

The Tanaka reference teaches in Figures 2, 7 and 17, the second mode is a camera mode which includes said recording mode (photograph mode) and the play mode (reproduction mode); and the electronic camera further comprises another mode setting device (switch 14) that chooses between said recording mode and the play mode when the camera mode is set (see pages 3-4, [0059]). The Tanaka reference is evidence the one of ordinary skill in the art at the time to see more advantage for the electronic camera system having another mode setting device that chooses between said recording mode and the play mode when the camera is set so that providing more flexible options to user for quickly choosing recording or review desired images. For that reason, it would have been obvious to the one of ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 2622

art at the time to modify the electronic device of Umezawa ('507) for providing another mode setting device that chooses between said recording mode and the play mode when the camera mode is set as taught by Tanaka ('096).

8. Claims 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Umezawa et al. U.S. Patent 5,491,507 in view of Watanabe et al. U.S. Patent 6,545,775, Tanaka et al. U.S. Publication 2002/0191096 and Kiyokawa U.S. Patent 6,204,877.

Referring to claim 14, the Umezawa and Tanaka references disclose all subject matter as discussed in respected claims 12 and 13, and the Tanaka reference discloses mode setting device including main slide switch (11, see page 2, [0039]) for controlling OFF/ON mode for turning off/on power of the camera and SPC switch for setting first mode (PC mode) or second mode (camera function mode including recording mode and play mode that set by a slide switch 14), except that the Umezawa reference does not explicitly show the mode setting device is a single slide switch for setting those three modes (first mode, second mode and OFF mode) by sliding in difference direction.

The Kiyokawa reference discloses in Figures 3-4, an electronic camera has a mode-setting device (47, see Col. 6, lines 60-64) that is a slide switch that can be locked to set three modes (telephone mode, camera mode and remote mode); and the camera mode which includes said recording mode and the play mode. The Kiyokawa reference is evidence the one of ordinary skill in the art at the time to see more advantage for the electronic camera system having a slide switch which can set more than two modes so that the mode setting device can simply and quickly perform the more functions by one switch. For that reason, it

Art Unit: 2622

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time to modify the electronic device of Umezawa ('507) for providing a single slide switch for setting those three modes (first mode, second mode and OFF mode) by sliding in difference direction as taught by Kiyokawa ('877).

Referring to claim 15, the Umezawa, Watanabe, Tanaka and Kiyokawa references disclose all subject matter as discussed with respected same comment to claims 13-14.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lin Ye whose telephone number is (571) 272-7372. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David L. Ometz can be reached on (571) 272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2622

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Lin Ye
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2622

December 1, 2006



DAVID OMETZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER